

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 23, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 2, and 9 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 2 and 9 can be found at least at paragraphs [0054] and [0055] pages 14-15 of Applicants' Specification and Applicants' Figure 9. No new matter is added. No claims are hereby added; no claims are hereby canceled. Claims 5-8 and 14-16 have previously been withdrawn per Applicants' election without traverse of Species I of Figure 9 (claims 1-4 and 9-13 readable thereon) in Applicants' Response to Election of Species Requirement dated August 25, 2005. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 9-13 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the Specification for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter and for reasons as noted at page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 thereby rendering the objection to the Specification moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the Specification.

In the Office Action, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention and for reasons as noted at page 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, the Examiner did not reject claim 2 over the prior art because the Examiner alleged that the scope of the claim was unclear (Office Action at page 4). Applicants have amended claim 2 and thus the Examiner's rejection of claim 2 is believed rendered moot. Support for the amendment to claim 2 can be found at least at Applicants' Specification [0054] page 14 and the claims as originally

filed. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of at least claim 2. Applicants respectfully point out that Applicants do not understand the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claim 2 as allegedly indefinite. The claimed limitation that the Examiner alleged to be indefinite read, "wherein the metal pattern is on the same material as the gate line." Applicants have amended claim 2 to read, "wherein the metal pattern is of the same material as the gate line." The change from "on" to "of" is a matter of a typographical error and at best should have only necessitated an objection to claim 2 for a minor informality instead of the alleged 112(2) indefiniteness rejection. Furthermore, the amended claimed limitation of claim 2 existed at least at claims 2 and 11 as originally filed. In fact, the Examiner rejected claim 11 in the instant Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the next Office Action, if any, must be Non-Final. MPEP § 706.07(a) instructs, "A second or any subsequent action on the merits in any application or patent involved in reexamination proceedings should not be made final if it includes a rejection, on prior art not of record, of any claim amended to include limitations which should reasonably have been expected to be claimed. See **MPEP § 904** *et seq.* For example, one would reasonably expect that a rejection under **35 U.S.C. 112** for the reason of incompleteness would be replied to by an amendment supplying the omitted element."

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0081155 A1 (to Moon et al.)(hereinafter "Moon").

The rejection of claims 1-4 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-4 are allowable over the cited reference in that each of these claims recite a combination of elements including, for example, "... wherein the metal pattern completely overlaps the UV-hardening sealant and is formed at four edges of the first substrate." The applied reference does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the applied reference.

The rejection of claims 9-13 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 9-13 are allowable over the cited reference in that each of these claims recite a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the metal pattern completely overlaps the UV-hardening sealant and is formed at four edges of the first substrate." The applied reference does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 9 and claims 10-13, which depend from claim 9, are allowable over the applied reference.


Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No.: 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant